

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. By this Amendment, Applicant has cancelled claim 14 and amended independent claim 1 to include the features of claim 14. Therefore, upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-13 and 15 are all the claims pending in the application. In response to the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims define patentable subject matter.

Claims 1-7 and 10 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Danneels et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,663,951, hereafter “Danneels”), in view of Ishibashi et al, (“A Synchronization Mechanism for Continuous Media in Multimedia Communication”, INFOCOM '95. Fourteenth Annual Joint Conference of the IEEE Computer and Communications Societies. Bringing Information to People. Proceedings. IEEE 2-6 April 1995 Page(s): 1010 - 1019 vol. 3, hereafter “Ishibashi”). Applicant respectfully traverses the prior art rejections.

As a preliminary matter, the Examiner objects to the Abstract of the Disclosure because of some informalities. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended the Abstract of the Disclosure in order comport to U.S. Patent and Trademark Office guidelines. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to remove the objection to the Abstract of the Disclosure.

Independent claim 1 recites in part:

a video link (L3-2) between these connection means (ML1) and the second pair (TM2, PC2), and
an audio link (L3-1) between these connection means (ML1) and the second pair (TM2, PC2),
wherein the connection means synchronizes audio and video data according to a delay.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in the cited references of the feature “wherein the connection means synchronizes audio and video data according to a delay”, as recited in the claim.

The Examiner acknowledges that Danneels does not teach or suggest this aspect of the claim.¹ The Examiner thus relies on Ishibashi to allegedly cure this deficiency. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s position.

The core of the present invention is the establishment of multimedia communications (in both ways, i.e., sending and receiving) between two pairs of audio and video terminals, in the specific environment of asynchronous networks, and the two terminals of at least the first pair are asynchronous. Packets are delayed with the objective of synchronizing audio and video streams in this specific environment (see pages 2 and 3 of the original specification).

Danneels has a completely different objective. Danneels only deals with capacity issues (that is, the objective of Danneels is to avoid overloading) and does not address specific issues regarding asynchronous networks with random transmission times (as acknowledged by the Examiner).

Ishibashi discloses a system which synchronizes or adjusts the output timing of media streams, where the media streams are a master stream and slave streams. Accordingly, Ishibashi synchronizes the slave streams with the master stream (Section 2). Ishibashi does not define the master stream and slave stream. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no

¹ Page 5 of the Office Action.

teaching or suggestion in Ishibashi (or any of the other cited references) of the feature “the connection means synchronizes audio and video data according to a delay”, as recited in claim 1.

Further, Ishibashi does not describe the communication between two pairs of audio and video terminals (FIG. 1 of Ishibashi). In Ishibashi, the source includes two terminals, whereas the destination only includes one terminal (there is no pair on the destination side, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion). Additionally, Ishibashi does not describe the specific configuration as disclosed in the claimed invention, i.e., the asynchronous networks with random transmission times.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has applied an unreasonably broad interpretation of Ishibashi.

Further with respect to claim 2, claim 2 recites in part:

first dating means (MD1) arranged to attach a transmit time mark and an identifier to audio and video data coming from the first audio (TM1) and video (PC1) communication terminal respectively before their transmission to the second pair via the said local network and to attach a receive time mark to the audio and video data coming from the said second pair and containing an identifier and a transmit time mark.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in the cited references of a local network, as recited in the claims.

The Examiner acknowledges that Danneels does not teach or suggest this feature of the claim. The Examiner thus relies on Ishibashi to allegedly cure this conceded deficiency. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s position.

Ishibashi discloses a synchronization mechanism in a high speed network. Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed local network is not equivalent to a high speed network.

Further, Ishibashi does not teach or suggest that the connection means synchronizes audio and video data according to a delay.

Further, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner clearly indicate how Ishibashi is being interpreted.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 should be allowable because the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the features of the claim. Claims 2-13 and 15 should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark E. Wallerson/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Mark E. Wallerson
Registration No. 59,043

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 7, 2008